

5

REMARKS

The present application was filed on June 2, 2005 with claims 1 through 26. Claims 1 through 26 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1-3, 12, 15-18, and 26 are proposed to be amended herein.

Entry of Amendment

10

In the final Office Action, the Examiner objected to the use of the word “third” in the phrase “designated *third* persons,” introduced in the prior amendment. The Examiner asserts that the phrase is not defined in the Specification and makes the claims clear and confusing. Applicants maintain that the term “third person” when discussing a communication is well understood by those of ordinary skill in the art to exclude the calling party (and is thus sufficiently clear and not new matter).

15

Nonetheless, in order to remove any potential ambiguity and to add additional clarity, Applicants have hereby amended the claims to remove the word “third” from the phrase “designated *third* persons” and have inserted the limitation “wherein at least one of said designated persons is not a sender of said communication.” This limitation is supported, for example, by the examples included in FIG. 3 and the corresponding discussion.

20

Applicants submit that since the proposed amended merely makes explicit the well understood definition of the phrase “designated *third* persons,” that this is not a “new issue.” This amendment is submitted pursuant to 37 CFR §1.116 and should be entered. The Amendment places all of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-26, in a form that is believed allowable, and, in any event, in a better form for appeal. It is believed that examination of the pending claims as amended, which are

25

consistent with the previous record herein, will not place any substantial burden on the Examiner.

Rejections

In the final Office Action, the Examiner maintained a rejection of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens (United States Patent Number 6,404,880).

30

Independent claims 1, 17, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens. Regarding claims 1, 17, and 26, the Examiner asserts that Stevens teaches generating a notification message (col. 3, lines 12-36).

Applicants note that Stevens is directed to “providing subscriber alerts that warn the subscriber to severe weather and traffic conditions.” Stevens also teaches that “the subscriber may receive wakeup and reminder calls.” (See, Abstract.) Assuming solely for the sake of argument that the

5 wakeup and reminder calls are triggered by employing a “caller ID” type function to obtain the telephone number of the calling party, the wakeup and reminder calls are placed back to the same original calling party.

10 In addition, the embodiment that provides alerts that warn the subscriber of severe weather and traffic conditions are also placed back to the same subscriber. Although not explicitly stated in Stevens, it is believed that in this embodiment, the telephone number of the subscriber is captured during a registration process using a “caller ID” type function to obtain the telephone number of the calling party, or is explicitly provided by the subscriber during the registration.

15 The Examiner asserts that the originating endpoint address 110 has one or more **designated** persons (citing the profile of FIG. 2). The profile of FIG. 2, however, is associated with the subscriber. If the conditions set forth in field 210 match the weather information received from the weather service 110, an alert will be sent to the subscriber. The subscriber has indicated the conditions 210 for the alert, as well as the communication methods 230 for receiving the alert. The weather service 110 is merely providing weather information that is matched against the subscriber conditions. The weather service 110 has **not** designated one or more persons to receive the information. Thus, there are
20 no “designated persons associated with said originating endpoint address.”

25 The present invention, on the other hand, initially determines an originating endpoint address on a network associated with a received communication, in a similar manner to a caller ID function in a telephone domain. The obtained originating endpoint address associated with the communication is then used to identify one or more **previously designated** persons to receive a notification message, “wherein at least one of said designated persons is not a sender of said communication.”

30 Thus, Stevens does not disclose or suggest identifying one or more designated persons associated with the originating endpoint address associated with the (received) communication; or sending a notification message to the one or more designated persons, “wherein at least one of said designated persons is not a sender of said communication,” as required by each independent claim, as amended.

Dependent Claims 2-16 and 18-25

Dependent claims 2-16 and 18-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens.

5 Claims 2-16 and 18-25 are dependent on claims 1 and 17, respectively, and are therefore
patentably distinguished over Stevens because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1,
17, and 26 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to
their base claim.

10 If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for
expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the
telephone number indicated below.

 The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



15 Date: October 3, 2005

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560